

BACONIANA.

VOL. VI. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1908. No. 24.

NOTES ON THE *MERRY WIVES* *OF WINDSOR.*

BY ALICIA AMY LEITH.

I N a very suggestive article on Justice Shallow by Mr. John Hutchinson in the January number of BACONIANA he says :

"The prototype of Shallow would, we conceive, be well known to the wits of the Inns of Court, and be recognised by them in his stage dress. Is it not conceivable that Sir Charles Percy, who was one of them, . . . may have come upon him down Dumbleton way?"

Absence from England prevented my answering this question sooner, but I take the earliest opportunity of forwarding some notes on this subject which I am more than glad to make public. If we open Shakespeare at *Henry IV.*, Part 2, Act I., S. ii., we read :

Falstaff.—"What said Master Dumbleton about the satin for my short coat and slops?"

Here we find the key to Shallow's identity. In my opinion he was partly drawn from a well-known City character of that day, Baptist Hicks, silk mercer and moneylender, one of the Justices of the Peace for Mid-

dlesex. He contracted for Crown Lands, 1561—1629, was M.P. for Tavistock 1609, for Tewkesbury 1620, was created Baronet 1620, and built a magnificent mansion in Gloucestershire in 1608, nine miles as the crow flies from Dumbleton, sparing no cost, and setting atop a huge lanthorn, "as a solace and landmark upon the dreary wolds," as his biography tells us. Is the lanthorn alluded to by Shakespeare? I think so, in the scene in *Henry IV.* already alluded to.

Sir Charles Percy* became possessed of Dumbleton by right of his wife, the daughter of Thomas Cocks, Esquire, in 1608, the same year as Hicks went down into the Cotswolds.

Of course, Sir Charles knew Hicks well, in London too, where his "bonds," "securities," and "assurances" were as familiar as household words.

I am inclined to believe that the play of the *Merry Wives* was laid and possibly first played in the fashionable suburbs of Clerkenwell and Islington. Ordish, in his "Shakespeare in London," says that Elizabethan playgoers expected to see places and people portrayed which they knew. The Forest of Arden, for example, according to him, was represented by Hampstead Heath! It added greatly to the zest of plays if the persons and scenes were from life.

On the spot where Messrs. Rivington's printing works stand once stood in Clerkenwell (Saint John's Square) an Inn or Tavern, noted for its carriers and its Justices of the Peace. There they held their sessions till Justice Hicks built them a Hall, known to time as Hicks' Hall, a landmark long after Lord Campden was gathered to his fathers. The Hall was built in 1610, and Justice Hicks was created Viscount Campden in 1628.

If we remember, the City magistrates and the actors were at variance in the early days of the theatres;

* Friend of Essex, bespoke Richard II. at his imprisonment.

indeed, the Justices made a clean sweep of them out of the City and they were forced to confine their public performances to the outskirts of London.

"The Bookman" has had interesting remarks on this subject ("Illustrated History of English Literature," p. 68, Part 2). It says, "The Corporation determined enemy of the Stage." Francis Bacon was fifteen or sixteen when Leicester's and Warwick's Company merged into Hunsdon's, and the Plague and the City magistrates sent the players to the green fields of Finsbury, Moorgate, Southwark and Clerkenwell.

In 1584 the City appealed to the Privy Council to demolish "The Green Curtain" of the late Holywell Priory. Walsingham then obtained leave to form the company of the "Queen's Servants." The Privy Council writes (1601), "We do understand that certain players that use to recyte their playes at the Curtain in Moorfields do represent upon the stage in their interludes the persons of some gentlemen of good descent and quality that are yet alive under obscure manner, but yet in such sort that as all the hearers may take notice both of the matter and the persons that are meant thereby" (Ordish, p. 90, "Early London Theatres"). Was Justice Baptist Hicks one of these?

Francis Bacon, the astute man of law, would in all probability try to protect his playhouse from trouble of this sort by masking the originals from which the characters were drawn under the safety of numbers. Justice Hicks was not the only model for Shallow. Giles Brydges, third Baron Chandos, of Sudely Castle,* Gloucestershire, was another; at least, so I think. Dumbleton lay only five miles as the crow flies from

* Mary Seymour, child of Catherine Parr, and her husband, Admiral Seymour, who lived at Sudely, married a Sir Edward Bushel. Probably one of the same Gloucestershire family referred to presently.

Sudely; nearer, in fact, than Campden. The question naturally arises, Why should this important person, one who more than once received Queen Elizabeth and entertained her royally, be caricatured in a Comedy?

His personality is lost sight of. I know nothing of it except that he was not everything that could be desired with regard to law or neighbourliness.

Lord Chandos, whose name would according to Elizabethan fashion have dropped the "n" and be pronounced more like Shaddow, as I take it,* made himself exceedingly unpleasant in the Cotswolds, if not ridiculous, with regard to a certain gentleman, his neighbour, Mr. Thomas Bushel. He seems to have accused Mr. Bushel of murdering a servant of his, John Yate. That he spread damaging reports about Bushel in the county is certain. Then charges were brought against Lord Chandos (by Bushel, I presume) of certain fraudulent suits to deprive him of land he had legally purchased. A letter is extant from Gyles Chandos to Thomas Bushel, 1578, in which he threatens, "Thou shalt be justly and truly answered in the Star Chamber." Walsingham was in correspondence with irate Chandos on the subject.

Thomas Bushel was the name of Francis Bacon's Seal Bearer and friend,† who remained faithful to him in his fall when others deserted him, and who wrote a beautiful vindication of his master in the "Farmer of his Majesty's Mines in London" [1659, 40]. He entered Francis Bacon's service at 15 in the year 1609. He would have been, as I think, more than likely the son of the injured party who possibly applied to Bacon's court to pro-

* Danvers was pronounced Da'vrs.

† Thomas Bushel, friend and servant of Francis Bacon, generously provided Charles I.'s army with cloth. The big army cloth mills were all in the Golden Valley, Gloucestershire, where Friar Roger Bacon lived.

tect him from Chandos. But this I allow is only conjecture. Chandos was, I must not omit to mention, Constable of the Cotswolds—the quarter, if we remember, where Page's greyhound, according to Slender, was outrun. In Act I., S. i., we find the following :

Shallow.—"Persuade me not. I shall make a Star Chamber matter of it. If he were twenty Sir John Falstuffs he shall not abuse Robert Shallow Esquire."

Slender.—"In the County of Gloucester Justice of the Peace and Coram."

Shallow.—"Ay, cousin Slender, and *Cust-alorum*."

Slender.—"Ay, and *ratolorum* too . . . who writes himself *armegero*."

Shallow.—"Ay, that I do, and have done any time these three hundred years."

In 1431 Ralf de Sudely bore arms in France with Henry VI. It was now the third hundred since he was at the closing scene of *la Pucelle's* life.

Let us not forget that the irritation of Sudely, I mean Shallow, bursts forth again in the words: "Knight, you have beaten my men, killed my deer, and broke open my lodge." At any rate, the country home of Justice Shallow was Gloucestershire, not Warwickshire, in the play. In this my prototypes come nearer the truth than Sir Thomas Lucy does.

If Justice Shallow is partly drawn from Giles, Lord Chandos, it is rather significant that Falstaff should say in Scene iii. of Act V. of *Henry IV.*, Part 2:—

"Master Shallow; my *Lord Shallow*; be what thou wilt."

And Shallow in the same scene in Gloucestershire says: "Under the King I am in some authority." He was constable of the Cotswolds.

Falstaff, in the same scene says: "You have a goodly dwelling and a rich."

Shallow.—"Barren, Barren, Barren."

Now Giles was the third Baron of Chandos. Nothing, of course, if taken by itself, but much when it is one of several facts.

Now to consider the question why Clerkenwell should be the scene of the *Merry Wives*?

Falstaff is the central figure of this comedy supposed to be written in fourteen days to please the Queen. Now Daniel, in his "Merrie England in the Olden Time," says that the Rose Tavern, Rose Alley, Turnmill Street, Clerkenwell,* was the scene (under the Rose) of Falstaff's early gallantries.† It was kept by one John Sleep, who also kept the "Whelp and Bacon" in Smithfield Pound. Apparently, then, "The Rose" was the Garter Inn—not at all a bad synonym.‡ This is a point in favour of my notion that this fashionable quarter of the London suburbs was the scene of the play, together with Islington, easily reached through the green and flowery lane known then as Longwich.

It would not have taken Falstaff long to get by it to Canonbury Mansion (the abode, as I believe, of Mr. Page in the play), and an absolute trifle to Justice Hicks in his coach.

The owner of Canonbury or Cambray House, as it was familiarly called, was a City Alderman—Sir John Spencer—whose daughter, sweet Elizabeth, was god-daughter of the Queen and, I think, the original of sweet Anne Page.

Rich Spencer, as he was named habitually, was

* The tavern in Clerkenwell where the Elizabethan magistrates met was "The Castle." Whether "Windsor Castle" or "Old Castle," either is suggestive.

† Knight's "London," Vol. I., p. 66.

‡ In the order as roses are worn round the neck, the garter on the leg.

owner of the splendid mansion in Bishopsgate—Crosbie Hall. For fowling and hawking and fishing he went out to Canonbury House, Islington, where his syllabub farm and hawking ground lay. A river ran by the house (the New River), and Frog Mere or More lay close at hand. Giles Heron, Sir Thomas More's son-in-law, once owned Cutlers, part of the Canonbury Estate, and so it may well be that there was a Herne's or Heron's oak there as well as in Berkshire. My readers will readily remember the allusions to these local things in the *Merry Wives*.

South of Canonbury lay the Priory of Saint John's, Clerkenwell, where the Master of the Court Revels lived. In Tylney's official book of the Revels in the British Museum is an item, "Glazing the windows of Saint John's Hall, where the rehearsalls be made." The office contained a "Wardrobe, and other several rooms for Artificers to work in, viz. : Taylors, Imbrotherers, propertie makers, Painters, wire-drawers, and carpenters, together with a convenient place for Rehearsalls, and setting forth of Plays, and other Shows for those services" * (1588-4).

When Edmund Tylney (1621) ceased to be Master of the Court Revels and licenser of plays (he licensed thirty of Shake-Speare's) Francis Bacon's secretary, Ben Jonson, succeeded him as Master in the Gate House. If to-day we go over the quaint Gate House, † Samuel Johnson is spoken of as a tenant ; Ben is never mentioned.

It yet remains for the Fords to be given a local habitation and a name.

Ford took the name of Brook, as will be remembered in the play.

* Edmund Tylney's "Court Revels."

† The Gate of the Priory of St. John of Jerusalem, now the head office of St. John's Ambulance.

One mile and a-half from Cambray or Canonbury was Old Ford and Brook House. Hackney, situated between two divisions of a stream, was a pretty flowery village at this time, rejoicing in as fashionable a reputation as Clerkenwell. The gardens of Brook House were far-famed, and remained so in Pepys' time. Orange trees were first cultivated here. In 1560—83 Lord Hunsdon* lived there, the Lord Chamberlain, with a company of servants or players. Brook House seems to have been Crown property; Edward VI. gave it to Lord Pembroke, and Elizabeth is said to have visited there. During her stay she is said to have held in her keeping the key of the Church; this reminds one that in Mrs. Gallup's decyphering of Bacon's Cypher she is said to have married Leicester from Lord Pembroke's house. Was it from his Hackney house? If Elizabeth stayed with Carey, Lord Hunsdon, who owned a troupe of professional actors who rehearsed at Saint John's Gate, were the *Merry Wives* performed on this spot to amuse her with local allusions? Fulke Greville, Lord Brook, owned Brook House later.

Mr. Page in the Comedy objected to his wealth attracting a lover of high degree, Fenton, who was offering his suit to his heiress daughter. "Rich Spencer" suspected the advances made by Lord William Compton to his only daughter and heiress and refused his consent to this match. Page distrusted Fenton, Spencer distrusted Compton, fearing (as Shakespeare puts it) he "should wish to knit a knot in his fortune with the finger of his substance." Like Page, Spencer's "consent went not that way."

Act III., Scene iv., Fenton says: "I cannot get thy father's love." And again: "He doth object I am too great of birth."

If he had been Compton, heir to the Northampton

* Henry Carey, first cousin to Elizabeth.

title, and wishful to marry a rich City moneylender's daughter, he could not have put the matter better. Fenton alludes pretty plainly to Anne's father's wealth. "Rich Spencer," obdurate, shut his romantic daughter up in a room in Canonbury Tower. Lord William, undaunted, disguised himself as a cook in the household and sent the pretty prisoner up *billets doux* in sweet confectionery, telling her to keep up a good heart, as he intended to carry her safe out of the Tower in a baker's basket, which he did—a parallel to Falstaff's exit in a Buck basket. The Queen, on the birth of a daughter to the happily wedded pair, obtained Spencer's tardy forgiveness and his wealth became theirs in due time. Later, when young Lord and Lady Compton were living in Canonbury House with their daughter Anne (1616), Francis Bacon rented the Tower from them. He lived in Canonbury mansion two years, and was in residence when he received the Seals;* and yet this fact is ignored in all his biographies, and at the Tower itself his name is not mentioned. Only Goldsmith and Johnson are said to have lived there. By the way, Goldsmith is said to have fled there from his creditors. Was it a hiding-place for our Gold Smith, who did more than most men to transmute base coin into true gold?

The facts I have stated are not all. Sir Anthony Cook, Francis Bacon's grandfather on Anne Lady Bacon's side, had a son William, who married Joyce, the daughter of Sir Thomas Lucy, of Charlecote, Warwickshire. He was given a grant of Highnam,† near Gloucester, the present estate of Sir Hubert Parry.

* Thomas Tomlin's "On Canonbury."

† Mary, daughter of John Brydges, first Baron Chandos, married Rowland Arnold, of Highnam, Gloucester. Their only daughter, Dorothy, married the son of Sir Thomas Lucy. Their daughter, Joyce, married Sir William Cook, who inherited Highnam.

(State Calendar, British Museum Reference Library page 317).

Henry IV., Part 2, Act V., S. i.

Shallow.—"William Cook let him come hither. For William Cook are there no young pigeons? Tell William Cook."

This scene is laid in Gloucestershire in Shallow's house. William Cook was Francis Bacon's cousin living in Gloucestershire.

Another interesting thing is that Francis Bacon himself was personally connected with Cheltenham, a few miles from Sudely. In 1597 he was presented with the Curacy of the Chapel of Charlton Kings, dedicated and made subject to the mother church, Saint Mary's, Cheltenham, in 1190. His church was in the deanery of Winchcomb, which is close to Sudely. The Rectory brought no profit to Francis, who said: "I praise God for it, I never took penny for any benefice or ecclesiastical living." What *did* yield profit in Cheltenham to its inhabitants was the plantation of tobacco, which flourished there from its introduction into England in 1565. This is not the first time that tobacco and Francis are found in juxtaposition, nor do I think it will be the last. This Curacy was leased by Francis for forty years. Edward IV. passed through Cheltenham on his way to the battle of Tewkesbury. The Abbey of Tewkesbury can be seen from Gloucester, where "lies the field of Tewkesbury." The tomb of Edward II. is in Gloucester Cathedral. How eminently Gloucestershire is a favourite county with Shakespeare! We have in *Richard II.*, Act II., Scene iii., that colloquy on the way to Berkeley, and how truly the author of the play knows the Cotswolds I can testify who have bicycled from Bird-lip to Berkeley.

Bolingbroke.—"How far is it, my lord, to Berkeley now?"

Northumberland.—"I am a stranger here in Gloucestershire. These high wild hills and rough uneven ways draw out our miles and make them wearisome."

Francis Bacon, as I believe, has here shown road-makers the necessity for altering the dreadful ups and downs which existed at that time. If the Cotswolds are bad travelling now their "rough uneven ways" were far worse then. We can trace the old roads, and their gradient in some places was more than one in six. Extraordinary steepness! The ascents and descents for travellers, indeed, then drew "out their miles" most unnecessarily. Before leaving the subject of Charlton Kings, may I add that I saw the name of Hamlet over a shop close against St. Michael's—Bacon, his church—and on a tomb in the churchyard. And now I bring this paper to an end with the hope that it may stimulate others to study Bacon in Gloucestershire and Islington.

THE CANONBURY INSCRIPTION

BY G. B. ROSHER.

MAY I be allowed, mainly with the view of recording some facts while the memory of them is fresh, to say something in continuation of the article on "The Canonbury Inscription" which appeared in *BACONIANA*, in April, 1903 (3rd series, Vol. I., p. 116).

When I wrote that article I had not examined the inscription subsequently to having formed the conjecture that the word in dispute had been *EAMQ*. Had I done so I should have spoken more confidently on the point than I did. Speaking from recollection of the traces, and from a sketch I had made of them before I had guessed what the word had been, I only ventured to say that "the few traces that remain of the letters

following the E *seem consistent with* the word having been EAMQ." But the first time I went to the Tower after having any particular letters in mind with which to see if the traces corresponded, I found I was in a position to say that *there could be no doubt* as to the word having been EAMQ., as the top of the A, the two tops of the M, the rounded top of the Q, and the tail of the Q, could all be distinctly seen.

They cannot, however, be seen now, as they have not survived the recent restoration. The lease of the Canonbury Constitutional Club, who occupied the Tower, expired in June, 1907, and the owner, the Marquis of Northampton, then resumed possession and restored the Tower, and in June of the present year re-opened it as a Social Club for the tenants of his estates in the neighbourhood, and their friends.

The above-mentioned traces of the A, M, and Q were clearly visible when I visited the Tower on May 31st, 1907, a few weeks before its occupation by the Constitutional Club ended, but these traces have no doubt succumbed to washing during the restoration. The inscription is stated to have been "merely washed and varnished," but I think there must be a slight inadvertence in this statement, or a misapprehension as to what, in fact, was done. Very likely washing and varnishing were all that was at first intended, but the inscription has obviously been repainted. Probably so much of the old paint came off in the washing that repainting became necessary. The result is that the habitual peculiarity in the last painter's handiwork (which I called attention to in my former article) of not joining the lower horizontal stroke of his E either to the vertical stroke or to the tick at the end, is no longer observable, as the restorer's brush has made the strokes continuous from the vertical to the tick.

The Tower is not now open to visitors except on the

introduction of a member of the Club, but there is not so much use in going there now for the purpose of ascertaining the identity of the damaged word as there was before June, 1907, as the restoration has obliterated the traces of the A, M, and Q that put the matter beyond doubt while they remained visible. It can still, however, be seen by a careful observer that the first letter was E; the original paint of the lower horizontal stroke being still traceable though the colour has departed from it. The letter has been restored as F, but the bottom stroke and tick that make the difference between an E and an F are still faintly visible.

Since writing the above I have looked up a letter which I received from Sir Benjamin Stone, M.P., who visited Canonbury Tower about the time that I first went there. The letter is dated Feb. 16th, 1902, and in it Sir Benjamin Stone says:—"I carefully examined the inscription at Canonbury Tower and you will be interested to know that I am entirely in agreement with you as to the first letter of the mutilated word being E. The chemical action of the paint is visible, though the black has partly disappeared." The last quoted sentence from Sir Benjamin Stone's letter strikes me as remarkably similar in substance to part of a sentence of my own description in the preceding paragraph—"The original paint of the lower horizontal stroke being still traceable though the colour has departed from it." I wrote this sentence two or three days ago after a visit to the Tower, not having at the time any recollection of the terms of Sir Benjamin Stone's letter of six years ago. Sir Benjamin Stone also stated in his letter that he was aware that Nelson, in his "History of Islington," had given the first letter as F, but said he was "prepared to say that he (Nelson) was wrong as to that." I may add that a friend of mine who accompanied me to the Tower in May, 1907, is prepared to corroborate what I have

said as to the traces of the A, M, and Q, being then plain enough to leave no doubt that the mutilated word was EAMQ.

What I am next going to say has no direct bearing on the word that has been in question ; but, while writing about this inscription, I may mention that the second line is not a complete hexameter, either as it stood before the restoration :—

“RI. JOHN HEN. TERT. ED. TERNI RIQ. SECUNDUS,” which is only five and a-half feet instead of six ; or as it stands now :—

“RI. JOHN HEN. TERTIUS ED. TRES RI. SECUNDUS,” which is altogether hopeless as a verse. Possibly the half foot deficiency may have been caused by the omission by successive restorers of letters that had become difficult to decipher. Richard II. now stands as RI. When I first saw the inscription a few years ago he stood as RIQ., Q. of course being an abbreviation for Que. Nelson’s “History of Islington,” published in 1811, gives RICQ. John Nelson said the inscription was “somewhat obliterated from damp at one end.” It was Richard the Second’s fate that his order in the series placed him at the damp end, where letters were apt to become illegible, and apparently to be ignored in consequence by restorers. There may have been previous restorations (especially at the damp end) in the 250 or more years since the inscription was put up, and as Richard II. has lost a Q and a C between 1811 and the present time, it would not be extravagant to suppose that he may have lost two or three more letters in the much longer period between the first painting up of the inscription in the reign of Charles I. and the time when John Nelson copied it. If Richard II. first took his place in the line as RICARDQ., the line with this lettering would have been a complete hexameter, as (like the

others), no doubt it originally was, for it is hardly possible to think that the writer of these verses would have allowed an incomplete hexameter to appear among them. The c given by Nelson raises the presumption that there were other letters, for it shows that Richard II. was not represented solely by RI., like Richard I. at the beginning of the line, and the mere addition of a c would not have had the effect of providing the syllable or half-foot which, in order to be a hexameter, the line requires; whereas the letters CARDQ. would have made the line a complete one, thus:—

RI. JOHN HEN. TERT. ED. TERNI RICARDQ.
SECUNDUS.

Although in referring to EAMQ. I have had to remark that the traces of A, M, and Q have been lost in the restoration, and that what can even yet be seen to have been an E has been restored as an F, I do not wish to be understood as making any attack on the restoration. No doubt restorers often deserve all the abuse they get, but in this case it should be remembered that we are dealing with minute and hardly noticeable details which have escaped the observation of some of those who have inspected the inscription with a knowledge of the controversy. In these circumstances restorers, coming to the work probably without that assistance, cannot be blamed for not having observed what some other people had not observed, or for having made the same mistake as to the E as had been made long before in Nelson's "History of Islington." On the contrary, if I may express an opinion about the restoration of Canonbury Tower, I should say that, regarded as a whole, it has been carried out thoroughly and carefully, with good judgment, and without sparing of expense, and in consequence there is now every prospect that this interesting old building will stand for another couple of hundred years or more.

THE "SCHOOLE OF ABUSE," 1579.

BY PARKER WOODWARD.

THE writer of the above and a few other pamphlets and verses was an exceptionally learned man. He indicated acquaintance (amongst many others) with the works of the classical poets:—Homer, Ovid, Simonides, Pindar, Virgil, Lucan, Ennius; the theologians, Solomon and David; the philosophers, Plato, Cicero, Maximus Tyrius, Æsop, Hesiodus, Pythagoras, Aurelius, Aristotle and Demosthenes; the historians, Sallust, Plutarch, Xenophon, Dion, Cæsar, and Pliny; and with the dramatists, Plautus, Seneca, Menander and Euripides. He punned upon the name of the English poet, Whetstone.

From an allusion on the second page of the "Schoole for Abuse," viz., "the vizard that Poets maske in," he would seem to have considered it orthodox for writers of poetry or prose (both at that day being called poets) to conceal their individuality.

The question I propose in this paper to consider is whether this little group of writings, 1579 to 1583, was the genuine work of Stephen Gosson, whose name is on the title pages, or was he only the "vizard" for another person.

Young Gosson was not twenty-one when, having graduated B.A. in 1576, he proceeded to London. He is described as having become a player and as having quitted that occupation to become a preacher. Eventually by gift of the Queen in 1591 he became Rector of Wigborough. He died in 1624, Rector of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, London, and was buried at night. It is very odd that a literary career commenced so brilliantly should (if his) have stopped abruptly in 1583.

On the authority of the Biliteral cipher story Francis

Bacon published his poetical and lighter writings under many vizards. That "Gosson" was one of them has not been claimed specifically in any cipher so far translated, but Bacon makes a general allusion to the occasional use of other names than those of Spenser, Greene, Peele, Marlowe, Shakspeare, and Burton. That the Gosson family had good friends at Court, Stephen obtaining the Wigborough rectory (gift of the Queen) and William becoming Her Majesty's drum player, supports the "vizard" assumption.

The dates of the "Gosson" writings offer further indication. Young Francis was in London in 1576, the date of the "Gosson" poem at the end of Kerton's "Mirror of Man's Life." When the two poems at the end of "The Pleasant History of the Conquest of West India," 1578, were added Francis would be back in London from abroad. The first poem is in distinctly "Spenserian" vein.

"Gosson" was noted (according to Francis Meres) for his admirable penning of pastorals, though no Gosson pastorals have come down to us. Yet Francis as "Immerito" and "Peele" was (while Gosson was still a player) writing pastoral verse and pastoral play.

The "Schoole of Abuse" is written very closely in the style of the "Euphues" of Lyly. It is passing strange, if not inconceivable, that two writers in the same year and in, as it were, the "first-fruits" of their respective "inventions," should independently possess and practise a new antithetical style, subsequently known as Euphuism. But if there were one author only masking under two different "vizards," the cause for wonder ends.

We have the authority of the cipher story that "Greene" was one of Bacon's "vizards" and the authority of Gabriel Harvey (Bacon's poetical adviser) that "Greene," "Nash," and "Lyly" were one and the

same personality. The printed testimony of Harvey is absolute on this point (see Pierce's "Supererogation," 1593).

That being so, one can notice with less diffidence that in the title of the "Schoole of Abuse," counting from the first "f," a sequence of letters will spell out "Francis Bacon." That this may not be entirely accidental is possibly indicated by the circumstance that in the head of the "Epistle Dedicatorie" (counting from the first "f") we again obtain "Francis," and from the bunched out words at the end of it (counting from the first "b") we obtain "Bacon."

Again, on the first page of the pamphlet in question it is suspicious to find references to "Virgils Gnat" and to "Dido," the one shortly afterwards used by Bacon as title for a "Spenser" poem, the other for a "Marlowe" play.

Later on in the "Schoole," p. 34, the author compares London to Rome and England to Italy, and says, "You shall finde the Theatres of the one, the abuses of the other to be rife among us. *Experto crede, I have seene somewhat*, and therefore I think may say the more." This remark is explicable from young Francis after about three years' continental travel, 1576-9.

At a shortly later date we find Bacon printing under the "vizard" of "Kyd" (the scrivener's son):—

"The Italian Tragedians were so sharpe of wit
That in one hour's meditation,
They would perform anything in action."

—*Spanish Tragedy IV.*

The late Mr. Bompas stated in his book on the Shakespeare problem that Italian players were settled in France from 1576 onwards.

In his scheme of writing a literature in the English tongue it will, I think, eventually be appreciated that Bacon made his various "vizards" refer to one another,

so as to increase the impression that the writings were by several individuals instead of by one. Of course the literary areopagus comprising Sidney, Greville, Dyer, and Harvey were in Bacon's secret. As proof of this, neither Greville nor Harvey ever mentioned "Shakespeare," although alive while the Shakespeare works were being produced. Writing as "Immerito," on the 16th October, 1579, Bacon makes a sly reference to the "Schoole of Abuse," evidently with the object mentioned above. Bacon and Sidney were, of course, hand and glove. The former at the beginning of the year 1579 dedicated his "Shepheards' Kalendar" to the latter. In August, 1579, he dedicated to him, writing as "Gosson," the "School of Abuse," and in the following November the "Ephemerides of Phialo." In 1582 he dedicated "Plays Confuted" to Sidney's father-in-law, Sir Francis Walsingham. Indeed, Bacon's association with the Sidney's and Walsingham's was so close that Sir Robert Naunton, a contemporary, printed the statement that for her third husband Sidney's widow (Walsingham's daughter) married Lord St. Albans! The suggestion that Sidney referred to "Gosson" in the "Apologie for Poetrie" has no foundation.

Careful comparison of the works under this "vizard" with those under other "vizards" confirms my theory as to the "Gosson" mask.

For instances :—

1. "Was easier to be *drawen* to vanitie by wanton poets *than to good government* by the fatherly counsel of grave senators.

"The right use of ancient Poetrie was too have the notable exploytes of worthy Captaines, the wholesome councils of good fathers and the vertuous lives of predecessors set down in numbers and song to the Instrument at solemne feasts that the sound of the one might draw the hearers from kissing the cupp too

often; the sense of the other put them in mind of things past and chaulk out the way to do the like. After this manner were the Bœotians trained from rudeness to civilitie."—*Schoole of Abuse*.

If the above words were written by Gosson himself and not by young Francis Bacon then the latter was entirely anticipated in his notion of the true interpretation of the Orpheus legend.

Moreover, in the like event, to Gosson must be attributed the first encouragement to the revived production of history in dramatic form, a characteristic of subsequent Elizabethan plays. Also the methods of peaceful persuasion—chalking out lodgings for soldiers rather than hectoring invasion—to which Bacon clung so persistently.

2. "Gosson" is to be found to have Bacon's objection to duelling. "The crafte of defence was first devised to save ourselves harmless. . . . Those days are now changed . . . the cunning of Fencers applied to quarrelling; . . . these no men if not for stirring of a strawe they prove not their valure uppon some bodyes fleshe."—*Schoole of Abuse*.

Compare what Bacon wrote under another vizard:—

"But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
When honors at the stake."—*Hamlet* IV. iv.

In "Gosson":—

"I have showed you loving countrymen ye corruption and inconveniencies of your plaies as the sclenderness of my learninge woulde afforde, being pulde from ye universitie before I was ripe and withered in the countrie for want of sappe."—"*Plays Confuted*," 1582.

3. In "Lyly" we find a reference to the University:—

"Wherein she played the nice mother in sending me into the countrie to nurse, where I tyred at a drie breast three years and was at the last enforced to weane myself."—*Preface to "Euphues his England"*, 1580.

4. "Gosson" possessed Bacon's contempt for the then existing system of University studies. "I cannot but blame those lithier contemplators very much, which sit concluding sillogismes in a corner; which, in a close study in the University, coope themselves up fortie yeres together, studying all things and profits nothing."—*Schoole of Abuse*.

5. "Gosson," like another of Bacon's vizards, "Nash," refers to the sepia fish:—

"But the fish Sepia can trouble the water to shun the nettes that are shot to catch her: . . . Whether our Players be the spawnes of such fishes I know not well."—*Apology of the "Schoole of Abuse."* Gosson. 1579.

"They are the very spawnes of the fish Sepia where the streame is cleare and the Scriptures evidentlie discover them, they vomit up ynke to trouble the waters."—"Nash," in *"Pasquil's Return to England."* Marprelate Pamphlet, 1589.

6. "Gosson" was a reformer. "They that are greeved, are Poets, Pipers and Players: the first thinke that I banish poetrie, wherein they dreeme; the second judge that I condemn musique, wherein they dote; the last proclaime that I forbid recreation to man, wherein you may see they are starke blinde. He that readeth with advise the booke which I wrote shall perceiue that I touche but the *abuses* of all these." So that, like Bacon under the vizard of "Immerito," he was concerned with the reformation of English poetry. Like him, he was interested in the harmonies of music and their true limitation; like him, as manifested under other vizards, he laboured for a reformed drama.

7. At an early age he wrote "Cataline's Conspiracies," played at the "Theatre." "The whole marke which I shot at in that worke was to shoue the reward of traytors in Catalin and the necessary government of learned men in the person of Cicero which foresees every danger that is likely to happen

and forestalles it continually ere it takes effect." There is much reason for believing that *Cataline*, which made its first appearance in print, like *Sejanus* (also written by Bacon), amongst Ben Jonson's productions, was one of Bacon's early plays. Jonson may have subsequently worked upon it, but his prefaces and dedications make no specific claim to authorship. Like *Julius Cæsar*, and other "Shakespeare" plays dealing with Roman history, North's translation of "Plutarch's Lives" is freely drawn upon, the author in each case also correcting from the original Latin. Having regard to the date of its publication and its curious reference to the 5th November—the date of the Gunpowder Plot—it would seem to have been revised and published subsequent to the Guy Fawkes attempt in order to point the moral of the wickedness of conspiracies against the State.

The problem of "Gosson" authorship seems only soluble on the assumption that Bacon was the author, and that Gosson, the player afterwards preacher, was only the "vizard."

The preacher (if author) stopped writing at the age of twenty-seven, died at the age of sixty-nine, and made no claim to authorship.

The "Gosson" writings comprise verse as good as "Spenser's" and prose as good as "Lyly's." The presumed author showed that he possessed a wide, and at that date rather exceptional, acquaintance with classical authors. He admitted authorship of three plays, of which *Cataline* discloses like methods of composition to the "Shakespeare" Roman history plays.

The "Gosson" opinions on certain subjects were the same as held by Bacon and other of his vizards.

The author knew of the practice of poets to veil their utterances under vizards, and yet, if Gosson was really the writer, he did not follow the practice he approved.

My conclusion is that the circumstances and dates indicate that the young player Gosson was only a mask for young Francis Bacon at the threshold of his efforts at the creation of an English literature and drama for the instruction and enlightenment of his race.

Bacon from his association with the queen and her revels would as readily be able to make use of young Gosson as he was with the Earl of Leicester's clerk Spenser.

SHAKESPEARE AND ITALY.

IN an article in *BACONIANA* for April last an attempt was made to vindicate Shakespeare's knowledge of the geography of Northern Italy, or perhaps, to be more accurate, to show that Mr. Horatio Brown, in his essay on "Shakespeare and Venice," had on wholly insufficient grounds called it in question.

In the *Nineteenth Century* for August, Sir Edward Sullivan has placed the result of the controversy beyond doubt. There has been no more valuable contribution for many years past to orthodox Shakespearean criticism than the article from his pen on *Shakespeare and the Waterways of North Italy*. The wonder is that the subject should not have been investigated before and the evidence now advanced brought to light. Sir Edward Sullivan proves by quotations from Italian writers of and prior to the seventeenth century, and with the aid of a map of Lombardy published in 1564, reproduced by permission of the British Museum, that the high road from Milan to Venice was by water, thus justifying Prospero's description of his midnight journey with Miranda to the sea, and further that a journey from Verona to Milan could have been performed in a similar manner, at any rate as to the greater part of the distance.

Only a few of the quotations cited can be here reproduced, and the article should be perused by all students of Shakespeare, but the following extracts will be read with interest. First, as to the journey from Milan to the sea, Bruschetti in his "*Istoria dei progetti e delle opere per la Navigazione del Milanese*" says :—

"As a matter of fact, at the end of the twelfth century, or the beginning of the thirteenth, the two largest canals which to-day traverse the interior of the province of Milan were in connection with the rivers Adda and Ticino, the first on the eastern side of Milan (formerly called Nuova Adda and Muzza at a later date) running towards Lodi ; the second, on the west, called Ticinello, leading towards Pavia. . . . It is well known that this same canal, before the end of the thirteenth century, under the name Naviglio Grande, was already adapted to the purpose of free and continuous navigation from the Ticino right up to Milan."

"The historian I quote from," continues Sir Edward, "tells us further that Milan had in the fourteenth century seen the advantages to be gained by a short and direct waterway to the Po (which was not, however, completed successfully until a much later date) ; but having extended the Naviglio Grande in the following century right up to the foundations of the Duomo for the purpose of carrying the marble of which it was being built from the Lago Maggiore, we find the city in 1497 in ship communication on one side (by the Naviglio della Martesna) with the Adda and on the other (by the Naviglio Grande) with the Ticino, the Po, and Lake Maggiore—a condition sufficient to justify Carlo Pagnano's statement in 1520 that Milan, far as it was from the sea, might easily be taken to be a seaport town." *

In the diary of Roberto Sanseverino, written about the year 1458, his journey from Pavia to the Holy Land

° "*Mediolanum, quanquam a mari remotum, maritima civitas facile existimari posset.*"

is described. He and his friends embarked at Pavia on the 1st of May, on the Ticino, arriving at Venice on the 6th. Their passage was delayed by heavy rains and contrary winds, the ship being frequently driven to shore.

In the "Life and Memoirs of Isabella d'Este" similar journeys are described, and it is mentioned that on one occasion the Court painter, Ercole Roberti, suffered much from sea-sickness on the journey up the Po. In May, 1527, it is stated, "Isabella once more resumed her journey and sailed up the Po to Governolo. . . . The next day *they sailed up the Mincio to Mantua.*"

Guicciardini's "History of Italy" is requisitioned to prove that through many centuries the Po and Adige had for all practical purposes been high seas for the contending navies of the hostile states whose dominions were made approachable by their waters. In June, 1431, Nicolò Trevisano, a captain of the *Signorie of Venice*, had a powerful fleet all but wiped out by the Milanese ships under Ambrogio Spiniola, close by Cremona.

English writers are also quoted in support of the contention that the usual method of travelling was by waterway. "The Pylgrymage of Sir R. Guylforde," relating a journey made in 1506, and the pilgrimage of Sir Richard Torkington in 1517, both contain statements confirming this view; also Fynes Moryson and Thomas Coryat. Speaking of Verona, the latter writes:—

"The noble river Athesis runneth by it. . . . This river yeeldeth a speciall commoditie to the citie. For although it is not able to beare vessels of a great burden, yet it carrieth prety barges of convenient quantitie, wherein great store of merchandise is brought into the city, both out of Germany and from Venice itselfe" (II. 90).

Sir Edward Sullivan points out that there is nothing in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* to suggest that the whole journey from Milan to Verona was made by water, although he is strongly inclined to believe that it may in fact have been possible. A footnote thereon reads:—

“The fossa, or canal, which joined the river Tarto with the Po at Ostiglia (ancient Ostia) is omitted on the map of 1564, but it undoubtedly existed from about the year 1000 A.D. (being marked on some other early maps), and was in all probability the canal by which the Venetian ships in 1510 escaped into the Adige, as described by Guicciardini.”

There is in the British Museum a map of Italy, published by Gastalde in 1564—the same year as that which is reproduced in the *Nineteenth Century*—which shows the water connection between the river Tartaro at Pontemolin and the river Po at Ostia. The through journey from Verona to Milan could therefore be conveniently accomplished by water. Nor is Sir Edward Sullivan content only to vindicate Shakespeare's hydrographical knowledge of Italy. He refers to the fact that critics, from Ben Jonson downwards, have described as a blunder the passages in *The Winter's Tale*, which attribute a sea coast to Bohemia. His defence of Shakespeare in this is also complete. Briefly it is this:—There is nothing in the play to warrant the assumption that the period of the action is that during which it was written. The mention of the oracle of Delphos suggests the Bohemia of a very much earlier date. Under the rule of Ottocar (1255—1278) Bohemia comprised all the territories of the Austrian monarchy which had up till then, with some few exceptions, formed part of the Germanic Confederation. Coxe, in his “History of Austria” (I. 29, ed. 1847) stated that “Ottocar became the most powerful prince in Europe, for his dominions extended from the confines of Bavaria to Raab, in

Hungary, and from the Adriatic to the shores of the Baltic."

Richard Johnson in his "Honourable History of the Seven Champions of Christendom," the oldest known copy of which is dated 1597, after describing the arrival of St. George in the Bohemian Court with his children, says:—

"Thus were St. George's children provided for by the Bohemian King, for when the ambassadors were in Readiness, the Ships for their passage furnished, and Attendance appointed, St. George, in company of his Lady, the King of Bohemia, with his Queen and a Train of Lords, and Gentlemen and Ladies, Conducted them to Ship board, where the Wind served them prosperously, that in a short time they had bid adieu to the Shore, and Sailed chearfully away."

Sir Edward Sullivan has conferred a great benefit on Shakespearean students by disproving conclusively the prevalent erroneous notions as to the poet's knowledge of geography. It has at the same time destroyed the favourite argument advanced against the Baconian theory—"Could Bacon have described Verona as a sea-port and attributed a sea coast to Bohemia?" The answer will now be, "Yes, he could and he did, and justly. Read Sir Edward Sullivan's article in the *Nineteenth Century* for August, 1908."

ARE THERE TRACES OF BACON IN *MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING*?

BY BASIL BROWN.

IT may be that Kempe, the Shakespearean actor, was related to Bacon. The following is an extract from a letter of Bacon's to his cousin, Kempe:—

"Good Robin,—There is no news you can write to me which I take more pleasure to hear than of your health and of your loving remembrance of me. . . . Your man Roger entered into a very subtle distinction to this purpose, that you would not come except you heard I was attorney. But I ascribe that to your man's invention, who had his reward in laughing. . . . For my fortune (to speak court) it is very slow, if anything can be slow to him that is secure of the event. In short nothing is done in that. Advise you whether you *will play the honest man* or no. . . . In the mean time I think long to see you. . . ."
—Fr. Bacon.

In *Much Ado About Nothing* Kempe plays the *honest man* Dogberry.

In "Actus Quartus" in the first folio edition of *Much Ado About Nothing* Kempe's name appears eleven times instead of the *honest man* Dogberry, whom he was representing. It has been said by some of the commentators that Kempe portrayed Verges, but even so Verges, too, was an *honest man*. However, we know from the first folio that he acted the part of Dogberry.

The very first words addressed to Dogberry are:—

Leon.—What would you with me, *honest* neighbour?

Dogb.—Marry this it is Sir.

Verg.—Yes, in truth it is Sir.

Leon.—What is it my good friends?

Dogb.—Goodman Verges speaks little of the matter. An old man sir, and his wits are not so blunt, as God help, I would desire they were: but in faith, honest as the skin between his brows.

* Spedding's "Letters and Life of Bacon," Vol. I., p. 261.

Verg.—Yes, I thank God, I am as honest as any man living that is an old man, and no honester than I.

So much for the Kempe letter and “honest man” coincidence. Robert Kempe, a young lawyer of Grays Inn, to whom the letter was written, was Bacon’s cousin, and if he afterwards became the Shakespearean actor he could easily have changed his name to William. We know that in the Tudor reigns relations “had to hang together or hang separately.” Bacon’s uncle, Lord Burleigh, had a Peter Kempe for his chief man as overseer at Burleigh House for many years. As far back as 1556 Anthony Kemp was a Post of the Court—a very secret and important office, which William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley, would be apt to put a relation in. I claim that there are reasons for believing William Kempe, the Shakesperian actor, held a like position at Court and that he was an actor when it suited his convenience. He dedicated his “Nine Days’ Wonder,” or Morris Dance, to one of Elizabeth’s ladies-in-waiting.

In Dr. Appleton Morgan’s Introduction to the “Hamlet and the ur-Hamlet,” XIII., he says :—“There was recently discovered in the Royal Archives at Copenhagen, the *Mounetz Besoldung ug Kostspendinge* (monthly payroll and board account) of the town of Elisnore for January 22nd, 1585, to January 22nd, 1587. In this is an entry in the year 1585 of a disbursement of four skilling to repair a board fence between the premises of Lauritz, the town clerk, and the yard of the Town Hall, ‘which the people broke down at the time the English played in the Yard.’ And, again, in 1586 is an entry of which Mr. Jacob A. Riis sends me this translation :—

XXXVI. daler Wilhemj Kempe, instrumentalist, got two months’ board for himself and a boy named Daniel

Jones. He had earned pay from June 17th, when he took service. In addition, a month's pay was given him as a parting gift. In all three months at twelve daler a month."

Burleigh and Walsingham were keeping a sharp look out in Denmark in the years 1585—1587, and Kempe could be trusted to play the spy for Elizabeth in the Danish Court. Mary, Queen of Scots, was then imprisoned in England and her son, we must remember, married a Danish princess. Kempe's Morris dance, performed in nine days from London to Norwich, was a miraculous feat in these days. But if, as it seems probable, he was a Post of the Court, his getting over so much ground in so short a time will not be wondered at.

In the same act and scene in *Much Ado About Nothing* there are more traces of Bacon. Dogberry says to Verges :—

Go, good partner go, get you to Francis Seacoal, bid him bring his pen and inkhorn to the goal ; we are now to examination these men.

Verg.—And we must do it wisely.

Dobg.—We will spare for no wit, I warrant you ; here's that (touching his forehead) shall drive some of them to a *non com.* only get the *learned writer* to set down our excommunication, and meet me at the gaol.

Why should the learned writer's name be Francis ? "The Stratfordians " may say this is another *mere accident*, and not a trace of Francis Bacon ; but when we say there was a little lane near Gray's Inn, in Bacon's time called *Seacoal Lane*, it seems to us one living in Gray's Inn as Bacon did would very naturally call the "learned writer" Francis Seacoal.

Next to Bacon there is no writer of the Elizabethan period so much at home in Gray's Inn as Shakespeare, and in the Records of that Inn there may be found over forty members of the Bacon family. Sir Nicholas

Bacon (Francis' father) was the first of this name to enter Gray's Inn.

Shakespeare makes Shallow relate with much gusto how he "did fight" with one Sampson Stockfish, a fruiterer, behind Gray's Inn.

When documentary evidence is not to be found circumstantial evidence should not be neglected, and the following may be of interest.

The two inimitable guardians of the peace, Dogberry and Verges, were undoubtedly taken from life. "Strype mentions that by reason of the frequent disturbances and unthrifths of the gentlemen in the Inns of Court and Chancery, in the streets at night, the inhabitants were obliged to keep Watches."—"Pearce's History of the Inns of Court and Chancery," p. 263.

In 1582 Bacon's friend, Sir Wm. Fleetwood, was Recorder. In this year "The Recorder himself, with six more of the honest inhabitants, stood by St. Clement's Church, to see the lanthorn hung up, and watch for some of these outrageous dealers. At about seven o'clock at night, they saw young Mr. Robert Cecil, the Lord Treasurer's son, pass by the church. The parish authorities, no doubt expecting one of the disturbers of their peace, were surprised when young Cecil (who probably had some suspicion of their business) gave them as he passed a civil salute. At which Strype informs us they said 'Lo! you may see how a nobleman's son can use himself, and how he putteth off his cap to poor men.' The Recorder was quite charmed with this evidence of Robert Cecil's innocence, and wrote a letter to his father saying, 'Your lordship hath cause to thank God for so virtuous a son.'"—*Ibid*, p. 264.

Now, here we have Francis Bacon's cousin, Robert Cecil, caught in a scrape at night by the Recorder and

six honest inhabitants, who stood by St. Clement's Church. *Mark the coincidence of the church!* When Dogberry gives his charge to the Watches, and bids them good-night, the 2nd Watch says:—"Well, masters, we hear your charge: let us go and sit here upon the church-bench till two, and then all to bed."

We will now connect Robert Cecil's politeness, when he "puts off his cap" to the "poor men" and gives them as he passes a "civil salute" in the style and fashion of the Court, with the conversation in the same act and scene between Borachio and Conrad:—

Bora.—Thou knowest, that the fashion of a doublet, or a hat, or a cloak is nothing to a man.

Con.—Yes, it is apparel.

Bora.—I mean the fashion.

Con.—Yes, the fashion is the fashion.

Bora.—Tush! I may as well say the fool's the fool. But see'st thou not what a deformed thief this fashion is?

Watch (aside).—I know that Deformed; a' has been a vile thief this seven year; a' goes up and down like a gentleman: I remember his name.

The Watch, who are concealed by the church, continue to listen to the conversation, and eventually spring out with:—

1st Watch.—We charge you in the prince's name, stand.

2nd Watch.—Call up the right master Constable. We have here recovered the most dangerous piece of lechery that ever was know in the commonwealth.

1st Watch.—And one Deformed is one of them. I know him a' wears a lock.

Con.—Masters, masters.

2nd Watch.—You'll be made bring Deformed forth, I warrant you.

Robert Cecil was deformed from his birth. When Bacon's Essay "Of Deformity" was published, Chamberlain wrote to Carlton that all the world thought it shadowed forth his cousin Cecil.

CLASSICAL KNOWLEDGE IN SHAKESPEARE.

THE danger to a military commander of too much success is referred to by Bacon in one of his letters to Essex. "All immoderate success extinguisheth merit and stirreth up distaste and envy" ("Life" II., 129). This is more characteristic of Roman military life than of modern, and the sentiment is most appropriately introduced in *Ant. Cl.* and *Coriolanus*. In both these passages the poet shows remarkable familiarity with a very singular feature of Roman government. This is well expounded in the words of Gibbon. He says of the first Cæsars that they were "not disposed to suffer that those triumphs which *their* indolence neglected, should be usurped by the conduct and valour of their lieutenants. The military fame of a subject was considered as an insolent invasion of the Imperial prerogative, and it became the duty as well as the interest of every Roman general to guard the frontiers entrusted to his care without aspiring to conquests which might have proved no less fatal to himself than to the vanquished barbarians. Germanicus, Suetonius, Paulinus, and Agricola were checked and recalled in the course of their victories. Corbulo was put to death. Military merit, as it is admirably expressed by Tacitus, was, in the strictest sense of the word, *imperatoria virtus*."

Plutarch tells us that the Emperor Domitian, through envy of the glory of Arulenus Rusticus, put him to death.

Tacitus writes: "Nec minus periculum ex magnâ famâ, quam ex malâ." ("Agricola," V.).*

Gibbon was one of the most learned and accomplished classical scholars of his time. But Shakespeare,

* See also *Coriol*, I. i. 267, *et seq.*

having, as we all know, acquired a most intimate knowledge of classic antiquities at the renowned school of Stratford-on-Avon—a school far superior to Harrow and Eton of the present time—may rank with Gibbon ; and expresses the same fact in far nobler language than that employed by such an inferior writer as Gibbon !

O Silius, Silius,

I have done enough ; a lower place, note well,
May make too great an act ; for learn this, Silius,
Better to leave undone, than by our deed
Acquire too high a fame, when him we serve's away. . . .
Who does i' the wars more than his captain can,
Become his captain's captain, and ambition,
The soldier's virtue, rather makes choice of loss,
Than gain which darkens him.—*Ant. Cl. III. i. 11.*

Banter apart, can anyone believe that this refined and exact knowledge of one of the most recondite features of Roman military life could be possessed by a rustic whose only training was in an obscure, remote, country town where many of the foremost townsmen were unable to write their own names ! No one believes it !

R. M. T.

"THE GRAVE'S TIRING ROOM."

A CRITICISM BY FRED C. HUNT.

MR. J. E. ROE, in his article, "The Grave's Tiring Room," in the July, 1908, *BACONIANA*, asserts that the supposed 1609 edition of the Sonnets was not issued "prior to Bacon's fall, though bearing the ante-date." I have never seen this statement made before, and would like to ask your contributor upon what evidence, aside from the sentiments expressed in the Sonnets themselves, he bases his statement.

Mr. Roe asks, "Will our Shakespearean critics point

some reference to this printed edition prior to 1621?" Permit me to answer that that has already been done. Mr. Dowden, who, I think, is entitled to be classed as a Shakespearean critic, says:—

"On May 20th, 1609, 'a book called Shakespeares Sonnetts' was entered on the Stationer's Register by Thomas Thorpe, and in *the same year* the Quarto edition appeared: 'Shakespeares Sonnets. Never before Imprinted. At London by G. Eld. for T. T. (Thomas Thorpe) and to be sold by William Apsley. 1609.' Edward Alleyn notes *in that year* that he *bought a copy* for fivepence. Some copies instead of 'William Apsley' have 'John Wright dwelling at Christ Church-gate.'"^{*}

What has Mr. Roe to say to Mr. Alleyn and his fivepence?

Mr. Roe further says, referring to Sonnet III,

"Believers in the Baconian authorship of the Sonnets—for to you we address ourselves—what say you? If Francis Bacon be the author of this Sonnet, to what circumstance in his life, please, can it allude? Can there be doubt that he here alludes to his already mentioned impeachment?"

As a believer in the Baconian authorship of the Sonnets, and having given them some study, I should answer, first, that as the book must have been in circulation in 1609, or Mr. Alleyn couldn't have bought a copy at any price, the Sonnet couldn't possibly refer to an impeachment of the author in 1621, and the verse must bear another interpretation than the one Mr. Roe has given it. Second, that it is highly improbable that a fraudulent entry could have been made in the Stationers' Register. That would have been a criminal offence. Third, they were advertised to be *sold* in different places, and this would have been inviting all kinds of inquiries

* "The Sonnets of William Shakespeare," Edward Dowden (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1896).

and investigations by proposed purchasers who found that they could not buy what had been advertised for sale. Of course, with the fall of the theory of a false date of the issuance of the Quarto must also fall the interpretation placed by Mr. Roe upon the other Sonnets supposed to deal with the same subject.

What, then, is the correct interpretation of this Sonnet, based upon the theory of Bacon's authorship? The verse appears as follows, according to the style of the Quarto :—

SONNET III.

O For my sake do you with fortune chide,
 The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
 That did not better for my life provide,
 Than publick means which publick manners breeds.
 Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
 And almost thence my nature is subdu'd
 To what it workes in, like the Dyers hand.
 Pittie me then, and wish I were renu'de,
 Whilst like a willing patient I will drinke
 Potions of Eysell against my strong infection.
 No bitterness that I will bitter think,
 Nor double pennance to correct correction.
 Pittie me then deare friend, and I assure yee
 Even that your pittie is enough to cure mee.

This number is part of a series commencing with number 97 in the line—

“ How like a Winter hath my absence been,”

and alludes to the “freezings” and “dark Daies” that the poet has seen. It is quite apparent from all of the context that this “absence” referred to is simply the cessation from literary work. In 98 he has been “absent in the spring” when even flowers (the emblem of his art) could not make him tell any “summers story,” that is, any dramatic or poetic story. In 100 he appeals to his Muse to revive herself and resume her work of praise of his genius, and the theme is continued

in 101. In 103 he asserts that his poetic strength has increased even if it hasn't so much appeared. In 104 we learn that this absence covered a period of three years—"three Winters colde," yet he assures his genius that he was not "false of heart," and that he has come back with tears of repentance. In 110 we begin to discover the nature of this absence. He had "gone here and there," and made himself a "motley to the view," and in the next number (the one under discussion) it is disclosed that this "going here and there" consisted in engaging in public life, which bred "public manners."

Now, in this number 111 the poet asks his creative genius, or soul, to chide fortune for his wanderings because that fickle goddess had not provided for his living, and he was thus obliged to engage in public life, where he had passed through so many troubles and disappointments. There seems to be here a direct allusion to the accident of the sudden death of his father, which left young Bacon unprovided for in life against his father's intention, and which forced upon him the study of the law, which, in turn, had caused him to exclaim that the "bar" would be his "bier." He was sick and tired of the baseness, hollowness, flattery, and strife and disappointment attendant upon the life of a courtier. This he looked upon as an "infection," as we see in Sonnet 67, where, after describing the baseness of his times in Sonnet 66, he says,

"Ah wherefore with *infection* should he live."

So, in Sonnet 111 he refers to the same "infection," which had reached himself, and which he was willing to drink "eysell" against, it being thought at that time that eysell, or vinegar, was a preventive of the plague. It is not hard to identify this period in Bacon's life. It evidently embraces the period of 1601 to 1603, covering his attempts to gain the office of

Attorney-General, when he was importuning his friends; when Essex was in a rage with the Queen because of her stubbornness; followed by the treason of Essex, Bacon's patron; Essex's tragic death, the slanders and threats against Bacon, the death of the Queen, the coming in of James, and the slow recognition of Bacon's merits. Indeed, Bacon had seen "darke daies" and felt the "freezings" of "old December's bareness." That he escaped with his life in the Essex conspiracy was a miracle, and he complains with bitterness of the threats of assassination that were made against him, and the "brand" which had been placed upon his name by reason of his association with the trial, conviction and death of Essex, the idol of the people. Speaking of this period of Bacon's life, Hallam says :—

"But he had passed the interval in active life, and in dangerous paths, deserting, as in truth he had all along been prone to do, the 'shady spaces of philosophy.'"

This seems a fair answer to Mr. Roe's question addressed to Baconians. The interpretation fits accurately with known incidents and conditions in Bacon's life, and at a time harmonizing with the probable date of the writing of this series of Sonnets, and without involving such a violent theory of the time of the issuance of the 1609 Quarto as your correspondent has advanced. And so all of the other Sonnet interpretations mentioned by Mr. Roe in connection with his theory will be found to possess much more rational readings than he has given them. This is noticeably true of number 68, upon which special stress was laid. In that number the poet is still talking of his art and comparing it with the poetry of antiquity—the poetry of the Greek philosophers. Thus he says his "cheek" (Art) is the "map" (used in the sense of pattern or delineation) of "days out-worn" (the old days) when

"beauty" (poetic art) died, and before the "bastard signs of fair" (the false and superficial poetry of his own time) were born, and before such poetry dared to "inhabit on a living brow" (to strive with immortal works) and before the "goulden" (not "olden") "tresses of the dead" (the same poetry of antiquity) which belonged to the sepulchre of the past ("the right of sepulchers") were used by moderns to ornament their own ephemeral verse ("to live a second life on second head"). In his art, he says, is seen the real art of the past—the art of the Greeks—in itself containing the truth of philosophy and not simply stealing or borrowing from the past to enrich a new poetry. His genius, he again asserts, was the "map" or delineation, which Nature was "storing" with philosophical truth—

"To show false *Art* what beauty (or *true art*) was of yore."

Guthrie, Oklahoma, U.S.A.

OF GREAT PLACE, BY SHAKE-SPEARE AND BACON.

BY ISAAC HULL PLATT.

IN spite of about a thousand resemblances or "parallelisms" between passages in the works of Bacon and those of Shake-speare, collected by Mr. Edwin Reed and others, Dr. Anders says he can find "no trace of Bacon in Shake-speare's works."* This is a strange statement, for, to say the least, there are many striking resemblances. If Dr. Anders had taken the ground that no conceivable number of "parallelisms" are conclusive proof of identity of authorship, he would have at least a foothold for de-

* Shakespeare's Books, by H. R. D. Anders, Ph.D. Berlin, 1904, p. 108.

bate ; but that he could find no traces—well, it would indicate that his search had not been very thorough.*

So far as I can remember, I have not seen any notice of the very remarkable parallel between the following passages. It may have been noticed and I may have overlooked it or forgotten it. Notwithstanding Mr. Reed's indefatigable and praiseworthy industry, his books are so poorly indexed that it is impossible to tell what is in them except by reading them through each time they are consulted.

Belarius :

"How you speak !

Did you but know the city's usuries,
And felt them knowingly; the art o' the Court,
As hard to leave as keep; whose top to climb
Is certain falling, or so slippery that
The fear's as bad as falling; the toil o' the war,
A pain that only seems to seek out danger
I' the name of fame and honour, which dies i' the search,
And hath as oft a slanderous epitaph."

—*Cymbeline* III. iii. 44.

"Men in great places are thrice servants; servants of the Sovereign or State; servants of fame; servants of business. So as they have no freedom; neither in their persons, nor in their actions, nor in their times. It is a strange desire to seek power and to lose liberty; or to seek power over others and to lose power over a man's self. The rising unto place is laborious, and by pains men come to greater pains; and it is sometimes base, and by indignities men come to dignities. The standing is slippery; and the regress is either a downfall, or at least an eclipse, which is a melancholy thing. *Cum non sis qui fueris, non esse cur velis vivere.* Nay, retire men cannot when they would; neither will they when it were reason; but are impatient of privateness, even in age and sickness, which require the shadow; like old townsmen, that will be sitting at their street door, though

* It might be added that Dr. Anders refutes his own statement, for on pp. 247-8 he *cf.* Bacon's "*Are the stars true fires?*" with Shake-speare's "*doubt that the stars are fire.*" Surely that is at least a trace.

thereby they offer age to scorn."—*Bacon, Essay XI., "Of Great Place."*

But the context in *Cymbeline* and the entire Essay should be read. It is hardly conceivable that anyone can take the ground that these resemblances—or rather identities—extending as they do, not only to the thought but to the very turns of expression—the passage from *Cymbeline* being merely a poetic paraphrase of the Essay—that they are accidental. It may, of course, be claimed that one writer has copied from the other. If so, which is the plagiarist? In this matter, of course, dates are of the first importance.

The Essay *Of Great Place* first appears in the second edition of "Bacon's Essays," 1612. *Cymbeline* is assigned to the period between 1609 and 1611—certainly not later, as Simon Forman, who died in 1611, mentions seeing a performance of that play. It would appear, then, that the play and the essay were written at about the same time. Certainly Shake-speare did not draw upon Bacon's Essay in print. Did he have access to Bacon's manuscripts, or did Bacon witness Shake-speare's plays and, in about a thousand instances, incorporate their language and sentiments in his writings? Commentators of both Bacon and Shake-speare usually tell us that it is extremely improbable that either man ever took the slightest interest in, or even saw or heard of, the other. To an ill-informed man, who is not a commentator and who does not boast of his scholarship, and who has not learned the scholarly habit of looking at all objects through a telescope with the big end to the eye—to such a man it would seem very unlikely that two such men should live for twenty years in the same small town of 60,000 people and never know of each other, especially when one of them was actually engaged all this time in supplying one of the "deficiencies" noted by the other—namely, a contem-

porary drama that should hold the mirror up to Nature ; and while all the time both were saying, in thousands of instances, almost the same thing in phraseology differing but slightly.

On the other hand Major James Walter, in his interesting but somewhat visionary "Shakespeare's True Life," tells us that the two great men discussed the plays, then in the making, seated under the two ancient cedars on Bacon's lawn at Twickenham, and, that there may be no mistake, he gives us a wood-cut of the very trees. This is most interesting, and it is greatly to be regretted that Major Walter withheld from us his sources of information.*

Really it is a most important question—this of the relations of the author of *Hamlet* and the author of the *Novum Organum*, but it seems to be beyond the pale of orthodox investigation. Shake-speare may be taken and cut up in little stars, as Juliet suggested Romeo might be after death, and distributed to Greene, Nash, Lodge, Kyd, Marlowe, Fletcher, and the rest ; but let the name of Bacon be mentioned in connection with that of the great dramatist, and the air is at once rent with hysterical shrieks, and yet there is more in Shake-speare's works to connect them with Bacon than with all the others put together.

* The source of Major Walter's information was his imagination. There is not a vestige of evidence in support of his assertion.—ED.

NOTES.

BY W. F. C. WIGSTON.

THE ORIGIN OF THE WITCHES IN "MACBETH."

IN the year 1605 King James I. paid a visit to Oxford, and was entertained there by the students of the University. This visit is described in a Latin work entitled "*Rex Platonicus; sive de potentiss. Principis Iacobo Regis ad Academ. Oxon. Adventu, Anno Dom. 1605*" (published Oxon. 1607. See Bodleian 4to L. 37 art.), which was written by Sir Isaac Wake, and a passage in this work is supposed, according to Anthony Wood, in his "*Athenæ Oxoniensis*," to have given rise, or suggested the subject of *Macbeth*. It is referred to by Farmer, and later annotators of Shakespeare, and particularly by Malone, in his edition of the plays (1790, Vol. IV. 436). The play of *Macbeth*, it is stated, did not appear till the year following the first edition of Wake's "*Rex Platonicus*." But before the passage alluded to is quoted, a little of the personal history of the author will not be out of place.

Sir Isaac Wake was the second son of Arthur, son of John Wake, of Hartwell, Northamptonshire, a descendant of the Lords of Blisworth. His father was Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and rector of Great Billing, Northants. His mother was Christian, the daughter of Sir William Wigston (Knight), of Wolston, Warwickshire. He was born about the year 1575, and was entered at Merton College, Oxford, in 1593, when he was eighteen years of age. In 1604 he became a student at the Middle Temple, and in the same year he was elected public orator of Oxford University. He took part in the reception of King James in 1605, delivering an oration "at the Hall stairs foot in Christ Church" (Nichol's "*Progresses of James I.*"), so he describes what he actually saw, or was acquainted with

at first hand. He entered the diplomatic service, and soon after 1609 became secretary to Sir Dudley Carleton at Venice. In 1613 he returned to England, and pronounced a funeral oration on Sir Thomas Bodley. He became British representative at the Court of Savoy, and in 1630 Ambassador to the French Court, but died in February, 1632, in Paris. His body was brought to England with the ceremony due to his rank, and he was buried, by the king's command, in the chapel of Dover Castle.

The passage cited, from Wood's "*Athenæ Oxoniensis*," describes a device performed by the students of St. John's College, Oxford, in which three young men, dressed as three sibyls, or witches, greeted King James I. after the same fashion, and with the same manner of prophecy, as Macbeth and Banquo are greeted by the three sisters in the play, which appeared "*the year following the first edition of that work*" (*Athenæ Oxon.*, Vol. II. 541).

"Quorum primos jam ordines dum principes contemplantur, primisque congratulantium acclamationibus delectantur, Collegium D. Johannis, nomine literarum domicilium (quod dominus Th. Whitus prætor olim Londinensis, opimis redditibus locupletarat) faciles eorum oculos speciosæ structuræ adblanditione invitât; moxque et oculos et aures detinet ingeniosa, nec injucunda, lusiuncula, qua clarissimis præses cum quinquaginta, quos alit Collegium, studiosis, magnaque studentium conviventium caterva prodiens, principes in transitu salutandos censuit. Tabulæ ansam dedit antiqua de regia prosapia historiola apud Scoto-Britannos celebrata, quæ narrat tres olim sibyllas occurrisset duobus Scotiæ proceribus Macbetho et Banchoni, et illum præduxisset regem futurum, sed regem nullum geniturum multos. Vaticinii veritatem rerum eventus comprobavit. Banchonis enim e stirpe potentissimus

Jacobus oriundus. Tres adolescentes concinno sibyllarum habitu induti, e Collegio prodeuntes, et carmina lepida alternatim canentes, regi se tres esse illas, sibyllas profitentur, quæ Banchoni olim sobolis imperia prædixerant, jamque iterum comparere, ut eadem vaticinii veritate prædicerent Jacobo se jam et diu regem futurum Britanniae felicissimum et multorum regum parentem, ut ex Banchonis stirpe nunquam sit hæres Britannico diademati defuturus. Deinde tribus principibus suaves felicitatum triplicitatis terminum vicibus succinentes, veniamque precantes, quod alumni ædium Divi Johannis (qui præcursor Christi) alumnos ædis Christi (quo tum rex tendebat) præcursoria hac salutatione antevertissent, principes ingeniosa fictiuncula delectatos dimittunt; quos inde universa ostantium multitudo, felici prædictionum successui suffragans votis precibusque ad portam usque invitatis Borealem prosequitur" (Wood's "*Athenæ Oxoniensis*," Vol. II. 541).

It would seem highly probable that this incident of the sibyls was re-introduced into the play of *Macbeth* not only as a compliment, but as a reminder of this Oxford episode and his visit to the King. Here let it be observed, that Francis Bacon never lets an opportunity escape to pay compliments to Queen Elizabeth and James I., and this, though the fashion of the times, is also conspicuous in the plays. Shakespeare, whose classical knowledge has been summed up as "little Latin and less Greek," would probably have been unable to have read Wake's work in which this episode of the sibyls is described. It would be interesting to discover whether Francis Bacon accompanied the King or was present at Oxford during these festivities?

CARDINAL WOLSEY.

There are two or three things in the play of *King Henry VIII.* it would be well to note. One is the

prominence given to the history of the rise and fall of Cardinal Wolsey, the author showing peculiar and profound intimacy with the Prelate's personal character, and it will not be amiss to point out, that the grandmother of Francis Bacon was the daughter of Sir William Fitzwilliam, who had been in Cardinal Wolsey's service, and who entertained him at Milton, his seat in Northamptonshire, after his disgrace. Sir William Fitzwilliam became treasurer and high chamberlain to Cardinal Wolsey, who appointed him one of the King's Council. Sir Anthony Cooke (1504—1576), the father of Anne, second wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, married Anne, the daughter of Sir William Fitzwilliam, of Milton, Northants (see "Dictionary National Biog.," Vol. XII. p. 76), consequently it is certain that Francis Bacon must have been in a position to hear, from the lips of his mother, Lady Anne Bacon, a great deal of the private character and life of Cardinal Wolsey transmitted from his great-grandfather, Sir William Fitzwilliam, through his daughter and her issue.

DOCTOR BUTTS.

Another very prominent figure introduced into this play, and also closely connected with the Bacon family, is that of the King's physician, Doctor Butts. In Blomefield's "History of Norfolk" (Vol. VII., pp. 164-5), will be found the genealogy and descent of this celebrated court doctor (under the local heading of Ryburgh Magna). Butts intercedes for Wolsey with King Henry VIII., and his interposition in favour of Archbishop Cranmer is well-known to readers of this play (Act V., scene ii.). He was court physician to Queen Anne Boleyn, and to Jane Seymour, the Princess Mary, and to Cardinal Wolsey. He married Margaret, daughter and heiress of Margaret Bacon, of Cambridgeshire, and by her had issue three sons, the youngest of whom,

Edmund, had one daughter, who married Sir Nicholas Bacon (the eldest son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Keeper of the Great Seal), and half-brother to Francis Bacon. The pedigree is as follows :—

Edmund Butts, third son of Sir William Butts (the Doctor of the play), married Anne, third daughter of Henry Buers, and had issue :—

Anne Butts, who married the above Sir Nicholas Bacon, eldest son of the Lord Keeper to Queen Elizabeth. He died 1625, and was the first Baronet of England. He had issue :—

Sir Edmund Bacon, Henry Bacon, Sir Robert Bacon. From this it is plain, Francis Bacon, as a younger son of a second wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, was in a position to pick up, from family gossip, a good deal of the private life and history of Doctor Butts, and of the part he played in the history of his times, and of his relations to King Henry the Eighth. It is exceedingly doubtful any dramatist without this intimate knowledge would have introduced Doctor Butts at all into the play? It is evident that the author of this play possessed some particular knowledge of this kind.

DOCTOR CAIUS.

In the play of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, there is a character, called Doctor Caius, who is the butt of much amusing ridicule. Doctor Caius, the founder of Caius College at Cambridge, died in the year 1573, the same year Francis Bacon, and his brother Antony, were entered at Trinity College, Cambridge. It is important to notice how Whitgift, who was appointed Master of Trinity College in the year 1567, and still reigned when the Bacons were there, expelled Cartwright, the leader of the Puritan Party, from his professorship. Dr. Caius adhered to the old rites, and possessed a private collec-

tion of ornaments, vestments, and service books. An order was procured to investigate, and the result was a most scandalous scene. In the court of Caius College, between the gates of Virtue and Honour, a bonfire was lit, and for three hours Whitgift, assisted by the heads of King's and Clare, were to be seen toiling resolutely, and perspiring, as he threw, "the Popish trumpery" into the flames.

It is, therefore certain that the brothers Bacon had the character of Doctor Caius* and his history held very prominently before their eyes during their freshmanship; and particularly as their mother, Lady Anne Bacon, was a rigid Puritan, they would feel inclined to dislike Caius. Very little is known of the life of Shakespeare, but of that little one thing is certain—he was never at either the universities of Oxford or Cambridge. And yet there are indications that the author of the plays was an *Academician*, and *acquainted with the three years' term*, or curriculum, of the colleges! This, for example:—

"Navarre shall be the wonder of the world ;
Our court shall be a *little Academe*,
Still and contemplative in living art,
You three, Biron, Dumain, and Longueville,
Have sworn *for three years term* to live with me,
My fellow scholars, and to keep those statutes
That are recorded in this schedule here."

—*Love's Labour's Lost*, I. i.

How familiar the author of these lines is with the college or university "*terms*," an expression still used to denote the periods when students are "up," and

* Mr. Edwin Reed, in "Francis Bacon our Shakespeare," p. 43, points out that the character in the play and Dr. Caius: both were physicians; both came from abroad; both were phenomenally quarrelsome, even to the extent of inflicting personal chastisement upon others with their own hands; and both hated Welshmen.—ED,

"*Michaelmas term*" is one of these periods ! To conclude this particular subject, it is very unlikely that Doctor Caius should ever have attracted the attention of Shakespeare, but it is certain that Bacon must have had, through Whitgift, and the particular facts recorded, occurring as they did just prior to his entry at Trinity, a striking object-lesson set before his eyes.

DR. ANDERS' REPLY TO MR. SOHMERS' COINCIDENCES.

IN the July number of "*Shakespeareana*" Dr. Anders replies to the Baconian coincidences as follows :—

"Griefswald, May 6th, 1908.

"A few 'coincidences' which the Baconians may adduce may, no doubt, fit in with either view. But the vital question is whether the coincidences brought forward by Mr. Joseph Sohmers—and he has probably chosen such coincidences as he considers particularly worthy of notice—can only be explained by the Baconian hypothesis. If this is not the case they can only be looked upon as pointing to a single solution in favour of the Baconian hypothesis, as Mr. Sohmers says.

"Let me begin with Mr. Sohmers' fifth coincidence. The argument, I am led to believe, is considered a particularly strong one by the Baconians. To my mind it weighs as light as a feather. But even Baconians will probably be obliged to leave this piece of evidence out of account in future. For if we may believe Dr. Engel, Bacon did not write the *Promus*, nor is the word 'rome' in the original manuscript. If it is in Mrs. Pott's book she must be put down as either a

wilful forger or as an ignorant transcriber. (Cf. 'Shakespeare,' Jahrbuch, XX. p. 226, and Engel, 'Engl-Literaturgesch,' S. V. der Bacon-Wahn.)

"Coincidence number six is answered by considering that the alleged error of submitting 'moral' for 'political' philosophy is more apparent than real. By 'political' philosophy, Aristotle, as his context amply shows, meant the ethics of civic society which are barely distinguished from what is commonly called morals. In the summary paraphrase of Aristotle's 'Ethics,' which was translated into English from the Italian, and published in 1547, the passage to which both Bacon and Shakespeare refer is not rendered literally, but its general drift is given as a warning that moral philosophy is not a fit subject for study by youths who are naturally passionate and headstrong. Such an interpretation of Aristotle is common enough among sixteenth and seventeenth century writers. In a French translation of the Ethics by the Comte de Plessis, published in Paris, 1553, the passage is rendered, 'Parquoy le ieune enfant n'est suffisant auditeur de la science civile,' and an English commentator, in a copy of De Plessis' book in the British Museum, in a note written about 1605, turns the sentence into English thus: 'Whether a young man may be a fit scholar of moral philosophy.' In 1662, an Italian, Virgilio Malvezzi, in his 'Preface Discorsi sopra Cornelio Tacito,' remarks, 'E non E di E non e discordante da questa mea opinione Aristotle il qua dice che gionani non sone buone ascoltatore delle morale' (cf. 'Spedding' Bacon I. 739, III. 440).

"The passage in *Othello* regarding the current from the Pontic Sea to the Propontic, finds its satisfactory explanation in the following sentence in Philemon Holland's English translation of Pliny's 'Historia Naturalis,' which appeared in 1601, several years be-

fore *Othello* was composed : 'And the Sea Pontus evermore floweth and runneth out into Propontis, but the sea never retireth backe again within Pontus.'

"The next coincidence makes no impression on my mind. What conclusions can you draw from the scrawls of one who practises handwriting, and who writes on the cover, 'Bacon,' 'Shakespeare,' 'Nashe,' etc.? I have not seen the original MS. What I know of it I have ascertained from Holzer's Baconian pamphlet, published in 1908. If I correctly understand him, he says the original MS. disappeared after it was published in 1904 ; so I confess to a sneaking suspicion that not everything is quite in order.

"As to coincidence ten, Mr. Sohmers asks me whether the name Falstaff was suggested by Halstaff. I can give no definite reply to the question. Let me ask Mr. Sohmers whether there might not be some link or connection between Sir John Falstaff in *Henry IV.* and Sir John Fastolfe in the first part of *Henry VI.*

"As to coincidence number two, Mr. Sohmers has certainly said too much when he declares that Perdita's remarks about flowers 'are an exceedingly close paraphrase of Bacon's "Essay on Gardens."' I have carefully compared the two, and have certainly found some correspondence. But Shakespeare had as good eyes and as good brains as Bacon !

"Perhaps he may have referred to some book or other on gardening and flowers. Coincidences numbers one, three, four, and nine may remain unanswered. It is no use to be told to pull at the other end of a rope of sand !

"I have thus done my duty, and tried to show the inconsistencies of ten coincidences adduced by Mr. Sohmers. I regret I cannot discuss his superogatory coincidence number eleven, as I am not able to make use of a work by Mr. Edwin Reed to which Mr.

Sohmers refers me. The German libraries refuse to spend too much money on 'Baconian' literature—and rightly so.

"Facts are chieles that wilna' dang.

"I am, yours faithfully,

"DR. H. R. D. ANDERS."

NOTES.

DR. ANDERS cannot be congratulated upon the result of his challenge to Baconians to produce ten convincing coincidences between Shakespeare and Bacon "where the resemblance is truly striking, and cannot be due to what we call accident."

Mr. Joseph Sohmers produced eleven such coincidences (BACONIANA, Vol. VI., p. 178), and in *New Shakespeareana* for July last appears Dr. Anders' reply, which will be found re-produced on page 253 of this journal. A more ludicrous fiasco has never disgraced a literary man. It will be seen that no attempt is made to explain coincidences numbers one, three, four and nine, as "it is no use to be told to pull at the other end of a rope of sand." Number eleven Dr. Anders cannot discuss, as he has no opportunity of making use of Mr. Edwin Reed's book to which Mr. Sohmers refers. By the laws of evidence, therefore, these five coincidences may be taken as proved, for Dr. Anders can produce no testimony to weaken their weight. Out of two of the remaining six Dr. Anders attempts to shuffle by methods which deserve the strongest reprobation. With reference to number five he says, "For if we may believe Dr. Engel, Bacon did not write the *Promus*, nor is the word 'rome' in the original manuscript. If it is

in Mrs. Pott's book she must be put down either as a wilful forger or as an ignorant transcriber." Why introduce Mrs. Pott's name? It is not mentioned in Mr. Sohmers' statement of coincidence number five. Dr. Anders' attack on her is both unnecessary and unjustifiable.

That the *Promus* is in Bacon's handwriting is vouched for by Mr. Maude Thompson, the Keeper of MSS. at the British Museum, who is the highest authority on the subject, by James Spedding, and by E. A. Abbot. Doubt on this point has never been raised,—it is an accepted fact—except by Dr. Engel, who had never seen the manuscript of the *Promus* and was quite unacquainted with Bacon's handwriting—a set of conditions which, according to the usual Stratfordian methods, renders him eminently qualified to give an authoritative opinion on the subject.

Coincidence number eight, founded on the Northumberland MS., Dr. Anders tries to evade by stating that if he understands Dr. Holzer correctly, "the original MS. disappeared after it was published in 1904! So I confess to a sneaking suspicion that not everything is quite in order." Of course Dr. Holzer never suggested such a statement. In reply to an enquiry addressed by the Editor to Dr. Holzer he says:—

1. With regard to Dr. Anders' statement, or rather mis-statement, I beg to say that I myself noticed his misconstruction in the July number of *New Shakespeareana* in the beginning of August, when I received the copy.

2. I addressed Dr. Anders in a letter, explaining his mistake to him, and I further remarked that, as he was so intimately acquainted with Elizabethan literature, he might possibly have come across a fac-simile of the overleaf of the Northumberland MS. in Spedding's book: "A Conference of Pleasure," 1870.

3. I have so far received no answer from Dr. Anders to my letter, nor any acknowledgment of receipt of my pamphlet, which I sent to him towards the end of May. But I still do not abandon a hope that the same will be forthcoming.

4. I happened to mention the incident to some of my

colleagues, who were amazed that Dr. Anders could possibly so misunderstand or misconstrue what I said in my pamphlet.

The manuscript is at Alnwick Castle, Northumberland, and, by the help of Mr. Frank I. Burgoyne, photographic fac-similes are in the hands of hundreds of Shakespearean scholars. Dr. Anders does not merely display ignorance, but by disingenuously making these charges, suggesting rather than stating that they are made under the authority of Dr. Engel and Dr. Holzer, he exhibits an intentionally dishonest mind.

Out of the eleven coincidences four remain, and to those Dr. Anders offers the weakest opposition. What can be more feeble than the way in which he slurs over the remarkable paraphrase of Bacon's "Essay on Gardens," which appears in Perdita's speech in the *Winter's Tale*? He says: "I have carefully compared the two, and have certainly found some correspondence. But Shakespeare had as good eyes and as good brains as Bacon!" True, as good, and neither better nor worse. That is the point at issue.

And yet Dr. Anders has the effrontery to say, "I have thus done my duty, and tried to show the inconsistencies of ten coincidences adduced by Mr. Sohmers."

It might not interest Dr. Anders, but it will certainly interest the readers of BACONIANA, to learn that Mr. Bernard Quaritch has just purchased for the Royal Library, Berlin, a complete copy of BACONIANA from the first number to the last, and the Library is now entered as an annual subscriber.

* * *

Mr. Harold Bayley's new book will be published within the next few weeks by Messrs. J. M. Dent and Co. under the title of "A New Light on the Renaissance."

JOHN CHURTON COLLINS.

AN APPRECIATION.

THE tidings of the sudden death of Professor J. Churton Collins would be received by members of the Bacon Society with feelings of deep regret. The world of letters has lost one of its brightest ornaments. His knowledge of the Greek and Roman Classics was extensive and thorough. He had studiously explored English literature, not only in its trodden paths but in its byeways, with a carefulness and penetration which were unusual in their fulness. Endowed with extraordinary powers of memory, he had acquired a knowledge of writers and their works which was ever ready for comparison or illustration. His English was clear and forcible and his thoughts were conveyed in language which was unmistakable in its meaning and pleasant to read.

With the Elizabethan period he was especially familiar. His "Studies in Shakespeare" will remain an indispensable volume in the library of every student of the poet. The "learning" of Shakespeare has formed one of the principal subjects of controversy since commentators on his works began to ply their trade. They generally accepted the position that the poet was ill-educated, if not illiterate, justifying that position by the statement of Jonson that he had small Latin and less Greek; of Drayton that "Nature only helpt him;" of Fuller that "his learning was very little," and even of his own apology to the Earl of Southampton, when in the dedication of *Venus and Adonis* he described his offering as "unpolisht lines."* Amongst the earliest opponents of this view were Charles Gildon,† the

* Farmer, either unintentionally or by way of strengthening his case, in his *Essay* quotes these words as "untutored lines."

† John Dennis, attacking Gildon for his opinions, declared that "he who allows Shakespeare had learning, and a familiar acquaintance with the Ancients, ought to be looked upon as a detractor from the glory of Great Britain."

Editor of an edition of his Poems in 1718; Pope, who supposed "little ground for the common opinion of his want of learning;" Theobald, who was "very unwilling to allow him so poor a scholar as many have laboured to represent him;" and Upton, who wondered "with what kind of reasoning anyone could be so far imposed upon as to imagine that Shakespeare had no learning. But when Dr. Farmer, in 1767, published his well-known Essay on the subject, the poet's lack of learning was supposed to be settled so conclusively that it could not be re-opened.

In more recent times Dr. Magiun (in Blackwood's Magazine, 1837), Mr. Spencer Baynes and Mr. Russell Lowell have urged the contrary opinion, but it fell to Professor Churton Collins in his Essay on "Shakespeare as a Classical Scholar," which originally appeared in the *Fornightly Review*, to establish the hypothesis that Shakespeare had a competent knowledge of Latin, was well acquainted in the original with the Latin classics, and possessed enough knowledge of Greek "to enrich his dictums with its idioms and phraseology."

The words in which, in 1792, Malone described Farmer's Essay may, with much more justification, be ~~applied to~~ applied to that of Professor Churton Collins, viz., that it is "the most conclusive Essay that ever appeared on a subject of criticism," and that its effect is that "the long-agitated question concerning the learning of Shakespeare was for ever settled."

Amongst the other Essays, all of which exhibit evidence of the writer's erudition, mention must be made of that on "Shakespeare as a Prose Writer." Professor Collins therein says:—

The truth is that Shakespeare's prose is a phenomenon as remarkable as his verse. In one way it is still more remarkable. The prose of Shakespeare stands alone. It was his own creation—as absolutely his own as the *terza rima* was Dante's, as the Spen-

serian Stanza was Spenser's. For every other form of composition he had models which he began by following very exactly. . . . But his prose is essentially original; and how greatly he contributed to the development of this important branch of rhetoric will be at once apparent if we compare his prose diction with the diction of those who preceded and of those who followed him.

The style of the prose of the higher comedy is described as "a style of which Shakespeare was the absolute and immortal creator, a style in which he has never been surpassed." As an example of the style or prose which Professor Collins classifies as highly-wrought poetical prose he says:—

This is the style where Shakespeare has raised prose to the sublimest pitch of verse and is, it must be confessed, the rarest of all his modes of expression. The finest and most obvious illustration of this is to be found in *Hamlet*, Act I., Scene 2 (this goodly frame, the Earthe, &c.). It would be hard to cull from the whole body of our prose literature a passage which should demonstrate more strikingly the splendour and the majesty of our language, when freed from the shackles of verse.

But the whole volume is of great merit and value. In *Ephemeræ Critica* Professor Collins includes several Essays of which Shakespeare forms the subject. Attention may be drawn to that on "The Religion of Shakespeare," in which the writer's clear discrimination may be seen at its best. Thus he states the poet's attitude toward "the undiscover'd country, from whose bourn no traveller returns."

Shakespeare, in truth, never attempts to lift the veil which for living men can be raised only by revelation. The silence of his philosophy—for we must not confound occasional sentiments and mere dramatic utterances with what justifies us in deducing that philosophy—in relation to a life after this is unbroken. It is, indeed, remarkable that he represents such speculations—the dwelling on such problems—as more likely to disturb, perplex, and hamper us than to give us any comfort.

In "Essays and Studies" are articles on the "Pre-

decessors of Shakespeare" and "The Porson of Shakesperean Criticism." The latter is a powerful vindication of Lewis Theobald as an editor and commentator. Here Professor Collins runs a-tilt at Warburton, Pope, Dr. Johnson, Malone, Leslie Stephen and the writer of the article on Theobald in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and apparently conclusively establishes Theobald's claim to the gratitude and veneration of students of Shakespeare. He describes him as "the father of Shakesperean criticism" and says of him, "It may be said with simple truth that no poet in our own or in any language has ever owed so great a debt to an editor as Shakespeare does to this man." Even where the reader may feel inclined to differ from the Essayist, he cannot refrain from being fascinated by the power and force with which contrary opinions are advanced—power and force which have their origin in the breadth of knowledge which the writer possesses and which are not "heaps of learned lumber."

But it was as a critic that Professor Collins was to be seen at his best. The sound of literary battle had a charm for him and into controversy he entered with delight. His blows were hard and were backed up by the strong moral force which he ever wielded. He wore no gloves and he gave no quarter. His essay on "The Bacon-Shakespeare Mania," which originally appeared in the *Saturday Review* as three articles of criticism on Judge Webb's "The Mystery of William Shakespeare," will be remembered by all readers of BACONIANA. Time will prove how far his attack on a body of earnest and honest students of Elizabethan literature was justified. Writing to Dr. R. M. Theobald, in 1904, with references to these articles, he said :

"You are quite justified in rebuking me for the very acrimonious and contemptuous tone of my essay, but I am a man who feels strongly on this particular subject, and therefore I have expressed myself strongly—too strongly, perhaps . . ."

The writer of this notice had the good fortune, only about two months ago, to discuss the subject very fully with Professor Collins one evening, and a fairer or more courteous opponent in controversy it would be impossible to have.

Professor Collins' sudden death inflicts a special loss upon the members of the Bacon Society. Arrangements were practically completed for him to deliver to them a series of lectures on Bacon during the ensuing winter session, and on the Monday evening when he was lying dead on the Lincolnshire broads, the Council of the Society were discussing dates for those lectures. The following letter has therefore a peculiarly sad interest attached to it.

I have been thinking over what you said to me, on that delightful evening we dined with you, about lectures on Bacon. Now, suppose you are disposed to fall in with my suggestion, may I entreat you kindly to remember that I have no sympathy at all with the Shakespeare-Bacon question; that my attitude towards it is precisely that assumed so offensively, I fear, in my published writings; that nothing I shall say is intended to have the slightest bearing on the question? I am perfectly well aware that such lectures most necessarily contain much, and very much, which Bacon-Shakespeareans can use and apply, if they please, to their own purposes. For instance, there are remarkable parallels between what can be deducted about Shakespeare's personal character, ethics and religion, and what we know about Bacon's. But with such applications I have no sympathy, and in them no interest so far as they touch the controversy. This will be quite understood, will it not—that I do not refer in any way to the Bacon-Shakespeare question?

Will you, then, kindly consider whether such a course as this would meet what you were thinking of when you spoke to me?

I.—Bacon as a Man.

II.—Bacon as a Politician (which would include his Religion).

III.—Bacon as an Essayist and Moralist.

IV.—Bacon as a Philosopher—the "Instauratio Magna."

V.—Bacon as a Humanitarian and Prophet.

If you are still in the same mind, will you think over'this, and tell me whether you are inclined to make an arrangement of this kind, either before or after Christmas?

Notwithstanding Professor Collins' violent antipathy to the subject, the mere discussion of which he described as being distasteful and repulsive to him, it is a fact that no man has, by his writings, done more than he to give it a sound and permanent foundation. The Shakespeare whom he has done so much to reveal is absolutely incompatible, on his own showing,* with the Stratford Shakspeare, and at any rate some substitute—whether it be Francis Bacon or some other—has to be found. Had the contemplated series of lectures been delivered it is possible that Professor Collins might have seen fit to modify his opinions as to what he termed “this ridiculous epidemic,” which “has now assumed the proportions and many of the characteristics of the dancing mania of the Middle Ages.”

Let the hard blows be forgotten, and let Baconians remember only the brilliant scholar and writer who has gathered together stores of literary ammunition, which remain to assist them in the battle they are waging against prejudice and convention on behalf of the truth, be it what it may.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

MR. GREENWOOD has every reason to be well satisfied with the notices of *The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated* by the public Press. The following extracts are significant because they admit, or imply, that the authorship of the plays is a subject of doubt :—

The Daily News :—“And let the biographers begin by confuting Mr. Greenwood. I cannot.”

© BACONIANA, Vol. VI., page 189.

Daily Mail :—"He (Mr. Greenwood) has written a book that ought not to be ignored by Shakespearean experts, and he has carried the war into the enemy's country, and provided plenty of matter for the consideration of those of the orthodox faith."

Manchester Guardian :—"On the destructive side his book is so strong that merely to call it the ablest extant argument against the identity of the Stratford-born actor with the author of the poems and plays does not give the full measure of its strength."

Bristol Times :—"Mr. Greenwood does not attempt to solve the problem; he simply sets out the evidence for and against the claims of William Shakspeare, of Stratford-on-Avon. And his verdict, as that of all unprejudiced persons must be, is that the claimant was not, and could not possibly have been, the poet whose works are so justly admired and revered by the whole civilised world."

Star :—"It is a tempting and tantalising book, but it is not light reading for the hot weather. It makes you think too hard. It stirs up all sorts of doubts in your mind. It rouses your scepticism and stimulates your incredulity. It spurs you into rebellion against authority. It breeds in you irreverence for literary mandarins."

The Observer :—"Pestilent heresies or no, his contentions are well worth studying, if only because they help to strip the Shakespeare cult of a deal of artificial, and, in some cases, nonsensical stuff with which it has become encumbered."

Sunday Times :—"Yet I would not deny the almost inconceivable hypotheses which adhesion to the traditional story involves any more than I would deny that Mr. Greenwood has exposed the weaknesses of the Stratfordian position with splendid lucidity and cohesion."

Graphic :—"Who, then, was this hyphenated Shake-speare? I can hardly bring myself to refer to a certain too notorious controversy. Happily, however, even if Shake-speare was not Shakspeare it does not follow that he was Bacon. Why not let identification remain a magnificent mystery, in company with the North, South Poles, and the secret of the Holy Grail, and the unseen side of the moon, and all other really interesting things."

The Academy :—"What he means to do and what he does very well, is to set out the case against Shakespeare. It is a pretty strong one, of course; it always was."

Nation :—"For our part, while still preserving our belief in the 'Stratford Yokel' we are quite ready to admit there is a Shakespeare problem."

The Bookman (a remarkable admission) :—"The point is, however, that having entered this book (as we have said) in a spirit of sanctimonious orthodoxy, we have emerged from it (despite some disgust at its persistent and unfair personalities) sick and sore at heart, our deepest convictions bleeding and battered; for the time being, at any rate, in a hardened, unrepentant, agnostic frame of mind."

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Can anyone throw any new lights on Francis Beaumont? I possess an old print of a handsome man of about twenty-eight or thirty, in Elizabethan dress; under it, in print, is the name Francis Beaumont, with a lion rampant as a crest. The picture might have been, as I think, taken from Francis Bacon at his zenith, before the cares of State and loss of teeth made his face worn and aged. The moustache is worn artist-fashion, not drooping, and the portrait altogether that of a particularly attractive, intelligent Courtier. Camden's *Brittania* (p. 445) gives: Beaumont, or Bellamont, established at Beaumanoir Park, Leicestershire, enclosed by Lords Beaumont, descended from a French family (*Vicomte de Bellamont*). "Certain it is," he says, "they come from John de Brenne, King of Jerusalem, and they settled in England about Edward I. Robert de Bellamont (*Beaumont*), a Norman, obtained a grant of this country, and married a daughter of Alexander Comyn, Earl of Bohun. Simon de Montford, 1206, married Amicia, sister and co-heir to the last Robert Bellamont, Earl of Leicester, and Lord High Steward. Henry III. conferred these honours on Edmund, his youngest son, and they came to John of Gaunt by marriage, and were revived in Robert Dudley, whom as Camden takes care to state, "Queen Elizabeth extraordinarily favoured." Simon de Montford, an Earl of Leicester, had land and an estate at one time on the site where Gorhambury stood later.

In Newe Town (Newington), Islington, has been found the arms of Bellamont—a Cinquefoil pierced. As the Dudleys were living in the Manor House of Newington it is a little difficult to know whether these arms were those of Robert Dudley or an earlier Earl of Leicester. Between 1103-1190 there were four Earls of Leicester, all Robert Beaumont. As to the later Francis Beaumont, Anthony Wood (*Ath. Ox.*), says: "He came to Broadgates Hall, 1596, with his elder brother Sir John, a poet, and person of great knowledge, gravity, and worth." But Wood insists that he must not be understood to be the same with Francis Beaumont, the eminent poet and *comedian*. Actor, I presume? "For though he was of the same family, and most of his name studied in Oxon., yet he was educated at Cambridge, and after he had made himself famous all over England for the fifty Comedies and Tragedies he, with John Fletcher, had composed, made his last exit in the beginning of March, 1615, and was buried at the entrance of S. Benedict's Chapel within the Abbey Church of St. Peter's, Westminster. As for John Fletcher . . . he was also a Cambridge man, and dying of the plague was buried in the Church, or Yard, of St. Mary Overy, Southwark. 29 Aug., 1625. Aged 49." If Beaumont was as famous as Wood says, it is a little strange that Cooper in his *Athen. Cantabrig.* mentions neither

him or Fletcher at Cambridge. The "Students' Encyclopædia" tells that Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher lived together on the Bankside, not far from the Play House, the same cloak and cloathes between them. The only other statement with regard to Beaumont I have is on page 3 of the Italian edition of Montaigne's Diary.

"*Audit Beaumont, M. D'Estissac se mesla à la trope.*" A footnote adds, "*Beaumont sur-Oise, Nota del primo Editore M. de Querlon.*" This D'Estissac was, I believe, Francis Bacon (see BACONIANA, July, 1908).

AN ENQUIRER.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—I have been much impressed by Mr. Terrel's explanation of the word *hid* in Ben Jonson's lines facing the portrait in the Shake-speare First Folio, and it carried immediate conviction. I have given much thought and study to those enigmatical lines, but I had not thought of that interpretation of *hit*. There is no doubt, however, that it may bear the meaning Mr. Terrel suggests. I have not access to the N. E. D. at the moment but I have consulted the Century Dictionary, with this result:

Hit 3 †, a (middle English) contracted form of *hideth*, third person singular, present indicative of hide.

This, of course, differs from Mr. Terrel's interpretation slightly, but not in a way to change the sense; it merely puts the verb into the present instead of the past tense.

But let us look through the entire stanza. The last two lines are very odd. After Ben's *apparent* praise of the picture we are told not to look at it. Singular commendation surely! This in itself seems enough to suggest an enigmatical meaning. Let us go back two lines from the one Mr. Terrel bases his comment upon.

"With Nature to out-doo the life."

Is it not quite possible that *out-do* is an inversion of *do-out*? I am not prepared to show that the word has ever been used in this sense, but it is not very far-fetched for a quibble, and seems worth considering. It hardly seems possible that Ben could seriously have entertained the idea that the perpetrator of that horrible caricature could have had a real struggle with Nature in the representation of the features of the gentle Shakespeare. Let us give Ben credit for not being quite such a fool.

Then we will examine the third line:—

"It was for gentle Shakespeare cut."

Now it surely is evident that *for* may mean *in place of*, but the Shakesperian knave is so absolute that we must speak by the card or equivocation will undo us. I again quote the Century Dictionary.

"FOR—In place of; instead of; in consideration of; as, to pay a dollar *for* a thing; two *for* five cents.

"To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord . . . to comfort all that mourn . . . to give them beauty *for* ashes, the oil of joy *for* mourning; the garment of praise *for* the spirit of heaviness (Isa. lxi. 2, 3).

"I'll give my jewels *for* a set of beads,
My gorgeous palace *for* a hermitage.

—*Shak., R. II. III. ii.*"

There are four more illustrations, but these seem enough. I have a vague suspicion that the word *cut* at the end of the line quoted above has some reference to the coat having being cut in two and half of it turned hind-side-before. In fact, there are so many "cuts" about the matter that it might mean any one of many things. Altogether it does "surpass all that was ever done in brass." Surely no more brazen humbug was ever perpetrated, and the author, like old Barnum, even has the audacity to tell us that we are being humbugged.

Paraphrasing the stanza, reading in the suggested meanings, we have this :

This Figure that thou here see'st put

It was [in place of that of] Gentle Shakespeare [which was for that purpose] cut [to pieces];

Wherein the Graver [which might mean, one who digs a grave] had a strife

With Nature to [do him out of his] life.

O, could he but have drawne his wit

As well in brasse [*i.e.*, if he could have succeeded so well in a brazen-faced imposition] as he [hideth]

His face; the Print would then surpass all that was ever writ in Brasse [*i.e.*, in one of the most brazen humbugs ever perpetrated.]

But, since he cannot, [quite hope to succeed to this extent], Reader, [don't bother yourself about the picture at all, but] looke

Not on his picture but his Booke [where you will find the real poet.]

I do not believe the quibbles are exhausted yet. In quibbling Ben was not to be excelled even by the Great Master.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

Wallingford, Pa., July 12, 1908.

NOTE.—Attention has recently been called (see BACONIANA, July, 1908, p. 197) to the peculiar ambiguity of the line, "And though thou hadst small Latin and less Greek." Such a number of phrases and sentences from Ben carrying double meanings certainly seems very suspicious.—I.H.P.

